

# **Exhibit 18**

1                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2                   NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
3                   SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

4                   IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE  
5                   (CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION

6                   Master File No.  
7                   3:07-cv-05944 SC  
8                   MDL NO. 1917  
9                   Judge: Hon. Samuel Conti

10                  VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF JAMES MCCLAVE, Ph.D.

11                  Taken on Behalf of the Defendant

12  
13                  DATE TAKEN:               Wednesday, June 25, 2014

14                  TIME:                       9:00 a.m. - 1:50 p.m.

15                  PLACE:                   Greenberg Traurig  
16   450 South Orange Avenue  
17   Orlando, Florida

18  
19  
20  
21                  STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY:  
22   NORA KELLY-MEOLA, RPR

23  
24  
25                  Job No. 80760

1 a company called BMCC?

2 A. Not unless BMCC goes by an alias and thus has  
3 data in these eight manufacturers' databases that I  
4 have.

5 Q. Did you utilize any plaintiffs' data in your  
6 analysis? By that I mean, transaction data by the  
7 actual plaintiffs you represent in terms of what  
8 products they purchased or what prices they paid or  
9 anything like that?

10 MR. LOUGHLIN: Object to the form.

11 A. No.

12 Q. Are you familiar with the fact that different  
13 retailers sometimes pay different prices for the exact  
14 same product from the same manufacturer at the same time  
15 after taking into account rebates and discounts, is that  
16 something you would examine?

17 MR. IOVIENO: Object to the form. You can  
18 answer.

19 A. I'm not familiar with that in that I have not  
20 analyzed or looked at plaintiff purchase data.

21 Q. Have you done any analysis as to whether or not  
22 a CRT overcharge you calculated would be passed on by  
23 the manufacturer of the television or computer monitor?  
24 Have you studied that issue at all?

25 A. I'm not sure I understand your question.

1 Passed on at what level?

2 Q. Okay. Let me explain. One of the plaintiffs  
3 you represent is Target; is that correct?

4 A. Target is one of -- yes, one of the plaintiffs.

5 Q. Would you agree with me Target doesn't really  
6 buy very many -- didn't buy very many CDTs or CPTs  
7 directly, it bought televisions or monitors essentially;  
8 is that correct?

9 A. I have a general understanding that that's  
10 correct for all these plaintiffs.

11 Q. Okay.

12 A. But Target in particular, I'll accept that.

13 Q. Okay. But that's your understanding for all  
14 the plaintiffs?

15 A. Yeah.

16 Q. My question is, have you as an expert examined  
17 whether the overcharge percentage you calculated on the  
18 CRT was passed through the TV set manufacturer or the  
19 monitor manufacturer to one of the retailer plaintiffs,  
20 is that an issue you examined at all?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Okay. So you have no opinion to offer on that?  
23 You haven't examined it, I assume you can't give an  
24 opinion?

25 A. That's right.